



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE JOURNAL OF POLITICAL ECONOMY

VOLUME 21

July 1913

NUMBER 7

THE THIRTEENTH CENSUS

The virtual removal of the head of the Census Bureau and the substitution of a successor, coincident with the advent of a new national administration, has necessarily brought forward some crucial questions respecting the principal statistical office of the nation. Many of these relate to semi-political issues. This is not the place to discuss them. But behind these lies the question of the future of the census, and of how that future will be affected by the past management of the organization. Into such a discussion there necessarily and unavoidably enters a political element. That, however, is not its chief feature. When all has been said, the problem whether the census has or has not been efficient during the thirteenth decennial enumeration, and if not, whether and how it will ever be possible to get a good administration of it, remains the central point.

I

At the outset it should be stated that the complete data for an accurate, inclusive, and thorough comparison of this census with its predecessors are wanting, and that to the extent that they are absent a judgment cannot be absolutely final. Thus far there have been issued Vol. IX and Vol. VI, and the Abstract of the Census, all in permanent form. The volumes now coming to hand include the following official explanation of the present state of things:

Of the final census reports listed on page 3, Volumes VI and IX have thus far been issued.

The volumes numbered I to XI, constituting the complete reports of the census, are being issued in a very limited edition, intended chiefly for libraries, institutions, and special students of statistics.

A condensed report, entitled Abstract of the Census, has been printed in a much larger edition, intended for more general distribution, and prepared in such a way as to meet the need of most persons desiring information concerning the results of the census. It contains in tabular form all important census statistics for the United States as a whole and for each state and principal city, together with a brief text explaining the figures and their meaning. The Abstract therefore is a condensation of the complete census reports, both tables and text, and not merely a compilation of tables.

The Abstract is issued in special editions for each of the several states, each edition containing a supplement giving the detailed statistics for counties, cities, and other civil divisions of the state to which it relates, designed to meet the needs of persons resident in that state or especially interested in it. The supplement contains also both tables and text.

As a compact reference work of general and local interest the Abstract is more convenient for most persons than the voluminous final reports.

There remain, therefore, still to be published nine out of eleven volumes of the final reports, so that by no means all of the data to be printed are within reach. But the census abstract is, as officially indicated, far larger and more complete than ever before and it covers, to an extent, the whole of the ground included in the scope of the census. This makes it possible to study the work as a unit, although somewhat from a distance. It must be admitted, however, that the complete data are not available, despite the circulation of many bulletins and outlines that give the persistent inquirer an idea of the facts.

Moreover, it is unlikely that these data will ever all be available. Many of them are already old and out of date. Appropriations for their immediate publication are wanting. It is doubtful whether they will even ultimately find their way to the hands of the public. If they do not, a final and absolutely authoritative judgment upon every portion of the census can never be rendered.

This general concession and reservation, however, itself carries a serious implication and registers a far-reaching and emphatic judgment upon the situation. Why was not the census completed and

issued earlier? This question stands out as one of the significant and basic problems in the whole situation. The fact that publication has been delayed far past the customary time is officially explained by the fact that Congress during the spring of 1912 refused an extra appropriation of \$500,000 which had been requested, and that in consequence it was necessary to discharge a large proportion of the force then on the rolls. Thereby the publication of the data already compiled was deferred and the compilation of still other data from the census schedules taken in the course of the enumeration was either stopped or greatly hampered. It is a fact that the legislative body did refuse to grant the appropriation asked for by the head of the census in the spring of 1912. But it is also a fact that prior to that time the census had received and had spent the whole appropriation of \$14,000,000 which had been estimated as the amount necessary for the collection and publication of the data. Any reply to criticism which rests simply upon the failure of Congress to grant more money is, therefore, superficial, since to appraise this refusal correctly there is needed a review of the work of the census designed to test the legitimacy of the call for more money. Before proceeding to such a summary review it is, however, desirable to remark that wherever the responsibility for non-publication of results be placed, the delay is in itself enough to destroy in very large measure the utility of the figures themselves. These may be considered as having a two-fold purpose, as scientific records for the use of statisticians and for the development of statistical inferences, and as data designed for the enlightenment of business men and public officers with respect to current conditions and the progress of the nation. While the former use may in some measure be fulfilled by the figures, however late they may be issued, the latter can never be accomplished unless the facts are put within the reach of the commercial community before they become obsolete.

The fact that the most obvious test of the utility of any census is the promptness with which its figures are made available has long been recognized even by Congress. The Twelfth Census enumerated the population, compiled results, and published nearly all its data within two years, bringing out one of the population volumes

as early as December, 1901. When the Thirteenth Census was undertaken it was desired by Congress to get the results of the work as promptly as had been done ten years before. As a census expert states it, Congress "secured by mandatory law the completion and publication of the Twelfth Census in two years. The same mandatory provision was re-enacted in the present law. No one doubted compliance with this provision, and the appropriation was voted in the belief that the time limit section would be obeyed. The appropriation granted was exactly the sum estimated as ample not only to complete the main reports of the Thirteenth Census within the time requirements but also to carry on the permanent annual work of the bureau relating to cotton, mortality, etc."

II

The census office was placed upon its present footing almost immediately after the inauguration of the Taft administration in the spring of 1909. When President Taft entered the White House the Census Bureau was still on a limited permanent basis but was preparing to undertake the task of collecting and issuing the regular decennial figures. It had been supposed that the permanency of the bureau and the partial application of civil service methods of appointment in its staff during the nine years then past would result in fewer changes of personnel and particularly in retaining at the head of the office the man who was in charge during the period intervening between the census periods. It was not long, however, before clashes occurred between the head of the bureau and the new secretary of commerce and labor. Into the merits of the controversy then developed it is not necessary to enter. Before the discussion had lasted thirty days, it had been resolved by the new administration to vacate the headship of the office and to appoint Dr. E. D. Durand, then head of the Bureau of Corporations, to prepare for and conduct the Thirteenth Decennial Census. The change was accordingly made and the new chief was placed in charge at the close of the spring of 1909. It was announced in a semi-official manner from the White House that the bureau was to be conducted absolutely free of political or personal influence, and upon a basis of scientific and non-partisan effort in such a way as to secure

the most speedy, most thorough, and most far-reaching census yet taken. For this purpose the sum of \$14,000,000 already referred to shortly became available.

Upon assuming control of the Census Bureau, and prior to beginning the real work of the census of 1910, the chief of the bureau found himself confronted by a difficult situation. In charge of the several divisions of the census were chief statisticians whose work had in some cases been open to serious criticism for years past. Had the Census Bureau gone out of existence in 1900, as was the custom of former years, these places would probably have been filled with new men when the work of the census of 1910 was begun. The permanent census act retained the organization of the bureau and kept the chief statisticians in charge of their several divisions, notwithstanding that it was often hard to find anything for them to do. The new head of the bureau was alive to the desirability of making some changes in the force. These had been recommended to him from many responsible quarters and he had himself indicated a disposition to undertake some of them. Whether because of political difficulties or from a feeling that changes would cause more friction than they were worth, the proposed alterations were nevertheless not made. The staff was continued upon its old basis. But, recognizing that the men in charge were not, according to his own point of view, altogether qualified for the work, the chief determined to supplement their efforts by employing a very considerable number of college and university men as special advisers and experts. These men were first to operate in reframing the schedules and later to help out in connection with specially difficult or technical phases of the actual investigations and reports.

Early in the summer of 1909 the task of reframing the schedules was therefore begun by large bodies of men supposed to be specialists in the various branches of economic study to which these schedules were most closely related. These experts were requested to produce the best possible list of questions for use in each of the branches of the census. The results were discouraging. Few of the "experts" had had any experience in practical work or were conscious of the practical problems or of the limitations of the census-taking process. Long, windy, and wearisome discussions resulted

in impossible attempts to put vague, hazy, or unpractical theoretical ideas into effect. An example of the net outcome of this work will presently be shown, but at this point it is enough to say that the results of the theorists' work were wholly impossible, and were admitted to be so by many of the very men who were engaged in the task.

And yet these bodies of theorists might have produced results possessing the qualities of their defects as well as the defects of their qualities, had they been left to carry their efforts through to a logical conclusion. This, however, was not to be. As has been seen, the old chief statisticians had been retained in their places as heads of divisions. They were not pleased with the calling-in of the experts nor were they inclined to accept the results of the work. They consequently proceeded to modify the schedules to suit themselves with the result that the lists of questions became illogical as well as impossible. Finally, the assistant chief of the bureau took up the lists and re-revised them. The results of the process were as follows:

1. Entire lack of responsibility for the ultimate form of the schedules.
2. Lack of cohesion, unity, and harmony within the schedules themselves.
3. Obscurity, excessive length, and impracticability in some of the schedules, notably that on agriculture.

This process was not only unsatisfactory but it was tremendously expensive. One who has been intimately associated with the census and who is recognized as an authoritative author on census topics, writes as follows:

Much was squandered upon the foolish experiments of the director in connection with a faculty he established of collegiate theorists who were entirely ignorant of the practical problems and limitations of the census. These alleged experts made impossible attempts to improve upon previous census presentation which have resulted in actual retrogression at numerous points, because they destroyed many comparisons, which are vital in all statistical work. The curse of American census administration has been the craze to tinker and improve. In consequence, except in 1890-1900, non-comparable census figures are the despair of students.

It might still have been possible to rectify the census schedules had there been complete willingness to do so. In some instances the lists of questions were recognized as being unsuitable and an effort was made by certain of those connected with the work to obtain genuine expert aid. The mining schedule affords a concrete example of the vain results of such efforts. After the original mining schedule had been completed, it was submitted to a distinguished mining engineer for an opinion regarding its practicability. The engineer went over it, made some important suggestions, and furnished a memorandum embodying them to those in charge of the work. None of the suggestions was adopted. Moreover, portions of the schedule which the engineer had shown to be absolutely impossible in practice were retained, verbatim, because, apparently, of the trouble and expense of changing the printed forms. Bad consequences were inevitable, and when they began to appear, as census-taking proceeded, it was necessary to send special agents to try to bring about a rectification of the data. That, however, proved to be a hopeless task because of the impossibility, under present bookkeeping conditions, of getting with any degree of accuracy the returns which were called for.

An actual exemplification of the work done by the experts employed on the schedules will make the point of this criticism clearer. Such an exemplification is afforded by the agricultural schedule, containing as it did hundreds of questions—probably about 750, according to a fair method of counting. A review of this document must undoubtedly lead to the following conclusions:

1. That the schedule was exceedingly complex.
2. That many of the questions were so general or so badly worded that correct answers were an impossibility.
3. That much of the information thus sought was, in the nature of things, unobtainable.
4. That, in consequence of these facts, scientific tabulation and use of the information obtained from the completed schedules was out of the question.

Moreover, when the schedule was put into the hands of enumerators, the situation was rendered even more embarrassing by the following circumstances:

1. Enumerators were so slowly and defectively examined that they were really named without examination.
2. Hence they were an uncommonly incompetent body of men.
3. Even with a much simpler schedule these enumerators would not have been able to understand and effectively put the questions.
4. The time allowed for filling this long, complex schedule was out of all proportion to the meager pay allowed for it.
5. Hence even the capable enumerators did not or could not spend time sufficient to get results.
6. The net outcome of these conditions was an exceedingly inaccurate, confused, and incomplete set of schedules.

III

Shortly after the schedules had been returned to the office and work had been actively begun under the new census organization with a view to compilation and tabulation, it became evident that there were likely to be unexpected delays. When the census of 1900 had been in process, considerable use had been made of machines for the punching of cards upon which the data of the census schedules were reproduced. After the census of 1900 was over, there began to be grave doubt whether it was worth while to use these machines at all. Many persons believed that the supposed advantages of the machines were open to very serious question. The whole subject was taken under advisement, and upon a review of the events of the census of 1900, it appeared that the machines employed in that census had been manufactured by a private contractor at a cost to the government of \$400,000. The headship of the census office was changed not long after the work of the census of 1900 was completed, and the new chief who then assumed control undertook to obtain the development of a new type of machine for use in the census of 1910. At the time when the headship of the bureau was again changed in 1909 it was supposed that the new machine had been practically perfected by inventors working in the employ of the government. The new census started with one machine which had been carefully constructed in the office itself and had given fairly satisfactory results. Other machines of like character were soon built and as soon as the population data came in the process of punching was begun.

As is well understood by those who have followed the development of the use of machinery on statistical undertakings, the routine statistical process of census tabulation is based upon the transfer of the returns indicated on the census schedule to corresponding cards upon which the data are represented by holes punched in specified spaces, the space selected and the symbol punched representing a given character of the return. When cards have been punched for each of the classes of data represented on the schedule, it is possible by the use of electrical machinery, a contact being made through each of the holes as the card is fed into a machine, to consolidate the data for final tabulation. The machines used in the census of 1900 both for punching and for consolidating the returns were somewhat slow and, it was asserted, not altogether accurate. In fact, a hand-tabulation of certain data, made after the close of that census for the purpose of testing the accuracy of the mechanism, showed a substantial percentage of errors, although this percentage was far less than had been charged by many of the critics of the figures given. It was, however, this dissatisfaction with the machines that led to the effort to perfect modified types of the mechanism, both for punching and for tabulating, which might be superior to the old ones, while at the same time, it was desired to free the census if possible from the heavy royalty payment which had been so expensive an element in the census of 1900.

The new machines, however, shortly turned out to be a great disappointment. They proved to be inaccurate, and, in consequence, a very large force for the rectification and verification of the cards had to be organized. In former years it had been the practice not to announce gross results for given census areas until the punching process had been completed. Because of the extreme delay due to the defects of the machine a new plan was adopted and results were announced in the gross without waiting for the detailed punching of cards representing all of the returns. This enabled the census in part to meet the demand for early preliminary results and thereby mask the real retardation of the work. This retardation was, however, present in even more aggravated form because of the time lost in announcing the advance summaries of the figures. The delay showed itself as soon as it was sought to get out detailed

bulletins, for the accumulated effects of the loss of time due to the early delays with the new machines then became obvious.

On the other hand, it should be noted in passing that a part of the basis upon which estimates had been made with reference to the total cost of the new census was in the supposed saving to be realized from the machines. This turned out to be an unfounded expectation. The new punching machines cost the office about \$250 each, while the old ones originally cost \$40 and could have been made ready for use in the census of 1910 at a cost of only \$5 to \$10 each, according to expert estimates. The payment for operating the old machines was at the rate of 30 cents per 100 cards, while on the new it was 20 cents, so that the possible saving, investment of capital and other factors being considered, could not have been very great in any case. It was estimated that, had the machines worked properly as they were expected to do, about \$90,000 would have been saved during the whole course of the census. Probably as much or more than that sum was used in doing extra work made necessary by the blunders and delays of the machines. It was the belief of the head of the Census Bureau that, in spite of the difficulties, the policy of developing this machine was wise and that, in spite of the delay and the additional cost, the future results will in all more than compensate for any sacrifice involved in the process of preparing the census of 1910. The fact remains that the census of 1910 did suffer very seriously in its earlier stages from the difficulties already referred to. Reference has above been made to the extensive and complex character of the agricultural and other schedules. This in itself was the cause of very great delay; while the processes of comparing, reducing, and unifying the figures were themselves lengthened and postponed owing to the problems of internal organization presented by the schedules already referred to. It was not strange, therefore, that practically from the time the process of tabulation and even of punching began, there should be continuous postponements and delays. These became cumulative and ultimately resulted disastrously.

Additional to the troubles which have just been sketched was the fact that, throughout the whole process of census-taking, it seemed to be difficult if not impossible to maintain a sufficiently stable body of employees. Mention has already been made of the way in which

the assistant director first appointed, participated in the framing of the schedules. It was essential that, if possible, men should be retained throughout the whole of the process of census-taking, in order that they might, if practicable, profit by the experience thus obtained. The assistant chief, however, did not long remain, and when he withdrew from the census he was succeeded as assistant chief by another man, who was obliged to work slowly into the duties of his office, getting his experience in the process of doing the work. Chief clerks of the Census Bureau—officials whose duties were vital to the smooth running of the force—succeeded one another with great rapidity: there were four in succession during the first three years of the census. Moreover, the clerical appointees who were selected were ill qualified and shifting, due to a peculiar provision in the civil service law, inserted just before the beginning of the work, which required applicants to have resided, for a year previous to appointment, in the states from which they came. Only under very limited and restricted conditions was the head of the bureau allowed to select experienced clerks who had had to do with former censuses.

IV

The difficulty in getting enumerators into the field with practicable schedules and the internal mechanical problems of compilation were, however, responsible only for delay and for primary imperfections in the returns supplied to the bureau. A proper use of these returns, a suitable editing of the data, a bringing of the information into harmony with itself and with that obtained in former censuses, might have resulted in securing a good body of figures, even had these figures been late and unavailable until their usefulness had partly passed. The question whether such a serviceable body of figures was or was not to be obtained was necessarily to be settled by the way in which the information was treated after entering the census office.

In former censuses it had been found that the data sent in by the enumerators were full of errors and imperfections. As a result of this state of things, it had been deemed necessary to edit the returns with considerable care. The consequence was a very material amount of departure from the original data as drawn from the schedules. Such variations had been strikingly made evident

in connection with the census of agriculture in 1900. The information then obtained differed so widely from any known facts that an investigation was made by commercial bodies, with the result that the use of a very extensive process of editing was revealed. This process of editing had involved considerable changes in the schedules themselves to correct manifest absurdities, the rectification of the figures by the use of test tables relating to crops, yields, prices, and so forth, for the various districts, and finally the writing of many thousands of letters to persons who were believed to have made erroneous returns either intentionally or unintentionally. It was a fair question whether this process ought to be pursued in connection with the census of 1910 and if so how far it should be applied. The matter was carefully considered.

It was, however, decided not to edit the census of 1910 to any such extent. The verdict rendered was based upon the well-founded beliefs that in former years the editing had given the census returns a character wholly different from that which they would otherwise have possessed, that errors in a large statistical undertaking tend to cancel one another, and that honesty demanded the presentation of facts exactly as ascertained. There is much to be said in favor of this view. If successfully adopted it would go far to wipe out many of the disgraces of past censuses when figures were shamelessly manipulated in order to show "prosperity." But—and this is essential—the attitude of superior righteousness could wisely and sanely have been accepted only if the takers of the Thirteenth Census were supremely certain that, because of the intrinsic merit of the methods employed in getting the figures, their work made a greater approach to real accuracy than did that of previous censuses. That they had no right to feel such certainty has already been pointed out. The decision to print the figures with but little editing was, therefore, of highly questionable wisdom and probably should not have been made. Whatever may be thought of it, the fact remains that the data for 1910 and 1900 are not comparable, that no one pretends that they are comparable, and that the data for 1920 will not be fully comparable with those for 1910 because of the manifest errors that appear in the figures now made public for the Thirteenth Census.

It may be inquired how these errors are to be detected in the

Thirteenth Census, if it be true that past censuses afford no absolute guide because of the fact that their data were so elaborately edited as to destroy all real basis of comparison with the figures now made public. This is a fair question. The belief that the failure to edit figures and the character of the schedule have resulted in actually erroneous returns, is based upon what is known of the general facts in the situation as drawn from other and collateral sources—from trade compilations of figures, from figures compiled by states, and from the computations based on earlier groups of figures which have had a known development from year to year. There are many striking facts in the new census to which it seems impossible to give credence and to which such credence is in fact refused by men experienced in the lines of work to which they relate. It would be impossible to cite the facts which justify this remark in much detail, but an example may be furnished. The census of agriculture shows that there was a tremendous falling-off in the number of cattle, swine, and sheep between 1900 and 1910. Of cattle this decrease amounted to 5,915,544, while of swine it was 4,682,365 and of sheep 9,055,852. The census admits the erroneous and non-comparable character of these figures by the remark that “due consideration must be given to the fact that the enumeration of 1900 was as of June 1, while that of 1910 was as of April 15. Had the census of 1910 been taken as of June 1, the number of animals . . . especially of cattle, swine, and sheep would have been materially greater than reported.” And again: “Had both censuses been taken as of June 1, there would probably have been much less decrease in the number of cattle and of sheep, a moderate increase in the number of swine, and a somewhat greater increase in the number of horses and of mules.” This is a confession that the figures as given are worthless or nearly so, and is also an admission that no effort was made to make them comparable by reducing them to an April 15 basis or by furnishing an average corrective table. Cases somewhat like this could be multiplied, but a briefer way to test the value of the figures is that of ascertaining the views concerning them entertained by practical experts who have examined them with a view to actual professional work. The utility of the figures for such a purpose is after all the ultimate test of the success or failure of any such great statistical undertaking. And, in the last analysis

the worth of such figures is the value received from them, or ascribed to them, by those who are dependent upon them for information. Tested by this standard, the census data as tools of immediate use appear in their true light. In that light they are today adjudged nearly worthless, for such is the almost uniform verdict of the men who are engaged in pursuits that involve a reliance upon census information. Reference has already been made to the mining census. An unquestionably competent mining engineer and statistician writes of

the very unsatisfactory character of the census work in connection with the mining industry. The whole thing is almost destitute of value. The fact that the mining engineering papers do not take the trouble to quote the census figures to any extent, or scarcely to mention them, ought to make it obvious . . . that something is wrong. Speaking plainly, the thing that is essentially wrong is that the census work on this subject is in the hands of officials who do not know anything in particular about the mining and metallurgical industry. I have no doubt that if the original returns now in the census office should be put into the hands of an expert he could dig out a good deal of value, but in order to get the best results in the taking of another census, the work ought to be under the direction of an expert from the beginning.

And again:

I have no desire to dig into the original returns received from the last census, nor do I advise the census officials to undertake that on their own account. The census returns are now several years old and a research into ancient history would be of no particular use to anybody. What I want to urge upon the new director of the census is the necessity for putting the technical statistical investigations in the hands of experts who know something about the industries concerned. Mr. ——— and Dr. ——— are not such men. So long as the census work is steered by such incompetents as they are, so long will the results be devoid of any great value.

Similar complaints regarding the various divisions of the census might be multiplied. Without much question, it would be entirely possible to reproduce the substance of the above letter with regard to almost every division of the census figures, the statements being in each case drawn from men who stand pre-eminent, and are of undoubted authority, in their several divisions of practical endeavor. This is true of agriculture, of manufacturing, and of mining so far as the data are as yet available. It is probably less true of population than of any other; although in connection with population figures some serious errors have been committed and trustworthy men

decline to accept the results furnished as regards some of the chief work of the Bureau in this regard.

It is enough to say broadly that practical men feel much more than the usual distrust they are in the habit of displaying toward census figures and that they are able to furnish apparently good reasons for their view that the data do not correspond to actual conditions as known to them.

Another natural and legitimate test of the worth and accuracy of the census results is afforded by the degree of consistency with themselves which the figures exhibit. If the data show results that do not accord with other findings given or inferable elsewhere in the census, students will naturally hesitate to accept any of the data as reliable. How far then are these census figures self-consistent? An enlightening example of the work that has been done is found in the bulletin dealing with the output of dairy products where it appears from the county tables of the New York Bulletin under the heading "Milk Produced & Sold" that Alleghany County produced 13,668,000 gallons of milk and sold 14,799,000 gallons. Several other counties also succeeded in selling more than they produced. Moreover, if the cream and butter fat sold in the entire state of New York come from milk, then New York, according to this bulletin, sold many thousand gallons more of milk than the state produced, even though no allowance be made for home consumption.

The accuracy of the figures may be tested in another way by comparison with the like or corresponding data furnished in the Twelfth Census. The Twelfth Census reported that New York produced in 1900 772,799,352 gallons of milk, but the Thirteenth Census now reports only 597,363,198 gallons. He would be a superficial student of American agriculture who did not know that during the past ten years there had been a decided improvement in dairy farming in the state of New York. The only conclusion, therefore, must be that there was a colossal blunder in 1900 as to these figures or a gross error today. The lay reader cannot settle in his mind which of these alternatives to accept, but of this he will be sure—that he should have been satisfactorily advised of the probable cause of the discrepancy and that he should have been supplied with estimates designed to furnish corrective data that he

might apply at his convenience for purposes of comparison. This is merely an illustrative and representative instance of the character of the census figures. To multiply such instances would occupy unlimited space but would not alter the nature of the criticism.

V

What will be considered by many persons the breakdown of the census of 1910 is the more regrettable because it undoubtedly deals a serious blow to the movement for a scientific and permanent Census Bureau. The principal argument that has been urged in past years in behalf of the placing of the census upon a permanent basis has been the fact that thereby efficiency, speed, and technical capacity would be advanced and the decennial renewal of a purely political, slow, and incapable force would be avoided. The argument in favor of putting a scientifically educated student of economics in charge of the bureau has been that by so doing statistical methods and administrative management would be improved, the tone and the personnel of the undertaking would be raised, and the general conditions under which the work would be carried on would be improved. Experience has furnished some ground for the belief that nothing has been gained in personnel, while there has been actual retrogression in the matter of speed and real efficiency and probably in the technical value of the figures themselves. The latter point, as has been elsewhere noted, may possibly be considered, in a measure, still open to question, if viewed from a long-range standpoint. From a closer point of view it is certainly the case that the figures for the census as now presented are less available for immediate use and less closely comparable with those of former years than has been the case during any census of recent decades. Believing this, members of Congress and others vested with authority will almost inevitably be disposed to discriminate against the idea of the permanent scientific bureau and to do what they can in favor of the restoration of the old conditions. The trend of the reaction is already observable in the substitution of a political appointee for a statistically trained man in charge of the bureau.

H. PARKER WILLIS